

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Friday, May 18, 2001
MAG Office Building
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Roger Klingler, City of Scottsdale, Chairman
Robert Hollander, City of Phoenix
Patrick Clay, U of A Cooperative Extension
Rick Rhoads for Cato Esquivel, City of
Goodyear
Dale Bodiya for John Power, Maricopa
County Environmental Services Department
John Boyer, Pinnacle West Capital
Dick Bradford for Bill Haney, City of Mesa
David Ryan for Eugene Jensen, Citizen
Representative

Kevin Kadlec, City of Peoria
Paul Bishop for Dave Siegel, City of
Chandler
Gene Cetwinski, Valley Forward
Association
Esmeralda Avila, City of Avondale
*Elaine Arena, Elaine Arena Associates
*Lonnie Frost, City of Gilbert
*Ray Hedrick, Salt River Project
*David McNeil, City of Tempe
*Chris Zapata, City of Glendale
*Elaine Arena, Elaine Arena Associates

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Gary Binger, Pacific Environmental
Resources Corporation
Seth Keeler, Pacific Environmental
Resources Corporation
James Matthews, Pacific Advanced Civil
Engineering

Joe Blanton, Town of Buckeye
Brandon Squire, RBF Consulting
Paul Gilbert, Beus & Gilbert
George Shirley, Carollo Engineers
Dennis Krahn, Hancock Communities,
Buckeye Land Management
Brenda Geisen, Maricopa Association of
Governments

1. Call to order

A meeting of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee was conducted on Friday, May 18, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. Roger Klingler, City of Scottsdale, Chairman, announced that since a quorum was not present a discussion would begin with Agenda Item 4.

4. Update on the Revision to the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan

Chairman Klingler indicated that George Shirley, Carollo Engineers, was present to provide a presentation on the Revision to the MAG 208 Plan. Mr. Shirley indicated that MAG internal review of the draft Description of the Study Area had been completed and comments had been incorporated. He indicated that drafts of the Description of Water Resources, Point Source Plan, and Nonpoint Source Plan Chapters had been reviewed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and the Arizona Department of Water Resources, and comments were being incorporated.

Mr. Shirley indicated that it is anticipated that drafts of the Point Source and Nonpoint Source Plans will be provided to the Committee members for review this summer. He indicated that drafts of the Management Plan and Public Participation Chapter are currently being reviewed by MAG staff. It is anticipated that the public participation process for the draft of the Revision document as a whole would begin in Fall 2001.

Mr. Shirley indicated that future water quality management planning issues may include continued population growth, expanding numbers of wastewater treatment facilities, increasing reuse, recharge and recovery programs, environmental problem areas, and an emphasis on improved planning.

Kevin Kadlec, City of Peoria, inquired whether the Clean Water Section 208 requirement under the current federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program would be included in the updated MAG 208 Plan in light of the current State primacy rulemaking.

Mr. Shirley indicated that the permit requirement for consistency with the Certified Water Quality Management Plan and a description of the Point Source Discharge Elimination System permitting program would be included in the appropriate section of the Revision to the MAG 208 Plan.

Mr. Kadlec also inquired whether MAG staff had been working to ensure that the requirement for conformance with the Certified 208 Water Quality Management Plan for all wastewater treatment facilities requiring a NPDES permit would be included in the State rules.

Brenda Geisen, MAG, indicated that MAG staff has made a recommendation to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality that the concept currently existing in the federal level requirement for NPDES permits for wastewater treatment facilities to be consistent with the Certified 208 Water Quality Management Plan be included in the State primacy rulemaking.

1. Call to Order

At this point, a quorum had been reached. Chairman Klingler called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the April 12, 2001 and April 26, 2001 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the April 12, 20001 meeting. Robert Hollander, City of Phoenix, moved and Paul Bishop, City of Chandler, seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the April 12, 2001 meeting.

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the April 26, 2001 meeting. Gene Cetwinski, Valley Forward Association, moved and Dale Bodiya, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the April 26, 2001 meeting.

3. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Facility

Chairman Klingler indicated that agenda item number three is for information, discussion, and possible authorization to conduct a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Facility. Brandon Squire, RBF Consulting and James Matthews, Pacific Advanced Civil Engineering (PACE), provided a presentation on the proposed facility.

Mr. Squire indicated that the proposed Sundance Wastewater Treatment Facility would accept flows from proposed residential and commercial developments within the Buckeye Wastewater Planning Area. He indicated that the existing sewer line in the area runs along Miller Road to the existing Town of Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant. He indicated that, due to the limited capacity of the existing plant and geographical constraints, it has been determined that hooking up to the existing facility would be impractical.

Mr. Squire indicated that excess reclaimed water would be disposed of through reuse on golf courses and other green areas, and that recharge options were being studied. He indicated any excess reclaimed water not reused or recharged would be disposed of through a discharge to the Roosevelt Irrigation District Canal. Mr. Squire indicated that Maricopa County is within three miles of the project and the County does not object to the proposed facility.

Mr. Matthews indicated that the design of the proposed Buckeye Sundance Facility would be similar to the Sequence Batch Reactor concept identified for the Goodyear/Litchfield Park Service Company Palm Valley Water Reclamation Facility and for the proposed City of El Mirage Water Reclamation Facility.

Mr. Matthews indicated that reclaimed water treated by the proposed facility would meet Class A+ standards for reuse and nitrogen removal. He indicated construction of the proposed facility would occur in phases and discussed the details of the technical operations of the proposed facility.

Mr. Kadlec inquired about plans for odor control for the proposed facility.

Mr. Matthews indicated the plant would use a caustic scrubbing system, and the odor control system would be located inside the building.

Mr. Cetwinski inquired about the design flow of the proposed facility, and where storage capacity would be located.

Mr. Matthews indicated Phase A would consist of 900,000 gallons per day and the ultimate plant capacity would be 3.2 million gallons per day. He indicated storage capabilities would exist with the golf course lakes and a potential recharge basin.

Mr. Cetwinski inquired about the status of the permits required for the project. He indicated that there are timelines associated with the permitting process.

Mr. Squire indicated a hydrogeological study was currently being conducted and an application for an Aquifer Protection Permit would be submitted upon completion of the study. He indicated the facility would not initially require a NPDES permit, as discharge would not occur in the initial phase of operation.

Mr. Cetwinski inquired about the proximity of the proposed facility to the 100 year floodplain.

Mr. Squire indicated the facility would be located within the 100 year floodplain, and this was considered in the design of the facility.

Mr. Matthews indicated the facility would be constructed according to 404 permit requirements.

Chairman Klingler inquired about the disposal of excess reclaimed water in the winter months when the reuse demand is reduced.

Mr. Squire indicated that, as a backup to reuse, an option for groundwater recharge is currently being investigated, but the permeability of the soil may be a limiting factor. He indicated that if recharge were not a viable option, the facility may discharge to the Roosevelt Irrigation District Canal.

Mr. Bodiya inquired about the status of negotiations with the Roosevelt Irrigation District.

Dennis Krahn, Hancock Communities/Buckeye Land Management, indicated that a draft agreement has been submitted to the District and a meeting has been scheduled with the Town of Buckeye and Hancock Communities to discuss the situation.

Mr. Hollander inquired about the entity responsible to obtain an end user General Permit under the new State Aquifer Protection Permit rules.

Mr. Matthews indicated that PACE and Pacific Environmental Resources Corporation are preparing an irrigation handbook for Litchfield Park Service Company as an end user, and that they would work with the Town of Buckeye as well.

Mr. Bodiya inquired about biological upset resolution for the proposed facility and if the sewer line would be used to transport sludge from the facility.

Mr. Matthews indicated that redundancy was included in the design of the facility, but an emergency storage facility has not yet been identified.

Mr. Squire indicated that the Town of Buckeye has requested that the facility be constructed to handle the entire waste stream.

Chairman Klingler indicated that this agenda item was for information, discussion and possible authorization to conduct a public hearing on the draft MAG 208 Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Facility. Mr. Cetwinski moved and Mr. Kadlec seconded and it was unanimously passed that a public hearing be conducted on the Draft 208 Plan Amendment.

5. Survey to Identify Possible Improvements to the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Planning Process

Chairman Klingler indicated that agenda item number five was for information and discussion. Ms. Geisen provided an overview of the MAG member agency response to the survey, and discussion ensued.

Committee members indicated that an ultimate capacity of 2.0mgd or less, with no discharge is still an appropriate criteria for a small wastewater treatment facility in the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. Using this process, a small wastewater treatment plant not specifically identified in the MAG 208 Plan can be approved as part of the Plan.

Mr. Cetwinski inquired about the specific meaning of “discharge” as defined within the MAG 208 Small Plant Review and Approval Process. He indicated there are different types of discharges by wastewater treatment facilities, each requiring different types of permits. For instance, a wastewater treatment facility discharge to an aquifer may require an Aquifer Protection Permit.

Ms. Geisen indicated there is a federal level NPDES permit requirement for discharges from wastewater treatment plants to be consistent with the Certified 208 Water Quality Management Plan. Plants with an ultimate capacity greater than 2.0 mgd which are not specifically identified in the MAG 208 Plan, or facilities with a NPDES discharge not specifically identified in the Plan would be required to go through a formal 208 analysis.

Mr. Cetwinski suggested that the Small Plant definition be changed to include plants with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 mgd or less, with “no NPDES permit requirement”, to clearly indicate the federal level NPDES permit requirement and distinguish a NPDES permit discharge from other types of discharges.

Committee members indicated that a small wastewater treatment facility, with no NPDES permit requirement, should be required to go through a 208 Amendment or Small Plant Review and Approval Process for an expansion of a capacity which would still meet the small plant threshold of 2.0 mgd or less.

Mr. Hollander indicated there is a concern with an uncontrolled proliferation of small plants, and the Small Plant Review and Approval Process is an important tool in addressing these concerns. He indicated the importance of a regional perspective when planning and approving development of small plants, especially in outlying areas.

Mr. Bodiya indicated that financial and technical capabilities tend to be more limited for construction, operation and maintenance of smaller facilities, and this can result in less effective environmental and economic management.

Committee members indicated that the current three mile radius is an appropriate distance for which communities should be notified and provided an opportunity to comment on a proposed project through the 208 Amendment and Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

Mr. Kadlec indicated the notification of communities is important, as there is a concern with the increased possibility of upset for small plants, and with the limited ability of small plants to effectively handle flows. He indicated the importance of allowing each community to comment on the potential impact of wastewater treatment facilities in neighboring communities.

Committee members indicated that the current MAG public notice of a hearing on a draft 208 Plan Amendment is appropriate. According to federal regulations, a hearing must be advertised 45 days in advance and the document must be available for public review 30 days prior to the hearing. A hearing notice is also sent to interested parties 30 days prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Hollander inquired whether MAG staff has received any public comment regarding concerns that they had not been notified early enough in the public participation process.

Ms. Geisen indicated MAG staff has not received public comments to that effect.

6. Call to the Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Water Quality Advisory Committee. No comments were received and the meeting was adjourned.

